

The Examiner asserts that "Assay teaches ... issuing to the subscriber a server-specific certificate for use by the server." The Applicant respectfully repeats its disagreement with this position. Asay merely has a certificate authority 102 that issues a primary certificate 110 to the subscriber mechanism 106. Asay also discloses a reliance server 104 that issues a secondary certificate 118. However, the reliance server issues the secondary certificate 118 to the relying party mechanism 108, not the subscriber mechanism 106.

However, even if Asay did teach such, the combination of references does not teach the present invention. The RSA Press Release shows a way to create PKI-enable applications that work with public key infrastructures from a wide range of vendors. Lapstun is relied upon by the Examiner as allegedly teaching maintaining an independent certificate and private signature key for each of a user's applications, to allow it to sign application transactions on behalf of the user. However, Lapstun does not show "corresponding" certificates, each certificate could be entirely unrelated to the other certificates. Each application appears to seek and receive its own certificate and private signature key that have no common master certificate. This is merely a duplication of effort that is avoided by the present invention.

Additionally, there is no teaching of the "issuing" a set of corresponding certificates for each application in Lapstun by an application. Further, the RSA Press Release system would not need any such system, since it is already compatible with various vendor systems. There is no motivation shown for combining the Lapstun and the RSA systems, as one system merely stores unrelated certificates and the other works within diverse infrastructures. The combination of the two systems with the Asay system nowhere

provides the claimed element of an application that issues corresponding certificates to each application based on a [corresponding] master certificate. For at least these reasons, the claims should be allowed over the art of record.


The remaining claims depend on respective independent claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons. The applicant also incorporates the arguments set forth in the previous amendment and responses in this response to claims 8, 9, 27, 28, 48, and 49, and the claims should be allowed for at least the same reasons

Summary

Applicants have made a diligent and bona fide effort to answer each and every ground for rejection or objection to the specification including the claims and to place the application in condition for final disposition. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested, and for the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition to be passed to issue and such action is earnestly solicited. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Robert N. Blackmon, Applicants' Attorney at 703-684-5633 to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

Dated: October 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,


Robert N. Blackmon
Reg. No. 39494
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Merek, Blackmon & Voorhees, LLC
673 S. Washington St.
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Tel. 703-684-5633
Fax. 703-684-5637
E-mail: RNB@MBV-IP.com